

plurality of frames without stopping for contention between frames (page 33). The invention has to do with an improvement in the manner in which burst transmissions are sent. A problem with burst transmissions is that they can occupy the channel for a long period of time during which a transmission of higher priority must wait for access.

One "solution" to this problem is simply not to provide burst transmissions, and require new contentions following each frame. This assures that the higher priority transmission gets an opportunity to assert its higher priority and seize the channel. This is the approach taken in Ruszczyk, which says not a word about burst transmissions, and deals exclusively with refinements in the manner in which contention is completed between transmission of each frame. The problem with this "solution" is that the time lost in the contention phase is lost for every frame transmitted. The efficiency of burst transmissions -- in which contention is not performed between frames -- is never achieved.

The invention provides a way of providing the efficiency of a burst transmission while also allowing a higher priority transmission to interrupt the burst. As described, for example, in claim 5, the invention achieves this improved performance by providing the priority level of the burst transmission within a contention control indicator that is transmitted in each of the frames (or at least each of the frames but the last frame, where the indicator can be left off as it is not necessary). Another station having a pending frame with a higher priority level can see the priority level of the frames in the burst transmission, and determine whether the frame it is waiting to send has a higher priority level, in which case it may interrupt the burst.

Providing the priority level of each frame as it is transmitted in the burst transmission is not the same thing as performing a contention between each frame, as done in Ruszczyk. The invention merely provides the priority level so that it can be examined by other stations. No contention ordinarily occurs, and thus the efficiency of a burst transmission is maintained. By contrast, in Ruszczyk, contention always occurs between every frame.

As Ruszczyk teaches nothing relevant to burst transmissions, and deals only with the mechanics of how contention is performed between frames, the rejections are unwarranted and should be withdrawn. (The examiner refers to FIG. 5 and element 506 as showing a burst, but

Applicant : Lawrence W. Yonge III et al.  
Serial No. : 09/632,597  
Filed : August 4, 2000  
Page : 3 of 3

Attorney's Docket No.: 04838-064001

element 506 is not a burst of frames, but simply the information that will be transmitted in a single frame.)

Accordingly, the independent claim is in condition for allowance.

The remaining claims are all properly dependent on one or more of the independent claims, and thus allowable therewith. Each of the dependent claims adds one or more further limitations that enhance patentability, but those limitations are not presently relied upon. For that reason, and not because applicants agree with the examiner, no rebuttal is offered to the examiner's reasons for rejecting the dependent claims.

Allowance of the application is requested.

Enclosed is a \$410 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

July 28, 2003



for

G. Roger Lee  
Reg. No. 28,963

Reg. No. 43,567

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110-2804  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906